

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 TESSERA, INC., No. C 05-4063 CW  
4 Plaintiff,  
5 v.  
6

7 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a  
8 Delaware corporation; SPANSION,  
9 LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
corporation; SPANSION, INC., a  
10 Delaware corporation; SPANSION  
TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Delaware  
corporation; ADVANCED  
11 SEMICONDUCTOR ENGINEERING, INC.,  
a Republic of China corporation;  
ASE (U.S.), INC., a California  
corporation; CHIPMOS  
12 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Republic of  
China corporation; CHIPMOS  
13 U.S.A., INC., a California  
corporation; SILICONWARE  
14 PRECISION INDUSTRIES CO., LTD., a  
Republic of China corporation;  
SILICONWARE USA, INC., a  
15 California corporation;  
STMICROELECTRONICS N.V., a  
16 Netherlands corporation;  
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC., a  
17 Delaware corporation; STATS  
18 CHIPPAC, INC., a Delaware  
corporation; STATS CHIPPAC (BVI),  
19 INC., a British Virgin Islands  
company; STATS CHIPPAC, LTD., a  
20 Singapore company,

ORDER MODIFYING  
BRIEFING SCHEDULE  
FOR LICENSE-BASED  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
MOTIONS

21 Defendants.  
22 \_\_\_\_\_/

23 SILICONWARE PRECISION INDUSTRIES  
CO, LTD; SILICONWARE U.S.A.,  
INC.,

No. C 08-3667 CW

24 Plaintiffs,  
25 v.  
26 TESSERA, INC.,  
27 Defendant.  
28 \_\_\_\_\_/

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1 CHIPMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; No. C 08-3827 CW  
2 CHIPMOS U.S.A., INC.; CHIPMOS  
TECHNOLOGIES (BERMUDA), LTD.,  
3 Plaintiffs,  
4 v.  
5 TESSERA, INC.,  
6 Defendant.  
7 \_\_\_\_\_/  
8 ADVANCED SEMICONDUCTOR No. C 08-3726 CW  
9 ENGINEERING, INC.; ASE TEST  
LIMITED; ASE (U.S.), INC.,  
10 Plaintiffs,  
11 v.  
12 TESSERA, INC.,  
13 Defendant.  
14 SPANSION, INC., et al., No. C 10-4954 CW  
15 Plaintiffs,  
16 v.  
17 TESSERA, INC.,  
18 Claimant.  
19 \_\_\_\_\_/  
20 POWERTECH TECHNOLOGY INC., No. C 10-945 CW  
21 Plaintiff,  
22 v.  
23 TESSERA, INC.,  
24 Defendant.  
25 \_\_\_\_\_/  
26  
27  
28

1 POWERTECH TECHNOLOGY INC.,

No. C 11-6121 CW

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 TESSERA, INC.,

5 Defendant.

6 \_\_\_\_\_ /

7 TESSERA, INC.,

No. C 12-692 CW

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 QUALCOMM, INC.; FREESCALE  
11 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.; ATI  
TECHNOLOGIES, ULC,

12 Defendants.

13 \_\_\_\_\_ /

14 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

/

15 Having considered Powertech Technology, Inc.'s motion for  
 16 clarification, the Court finds good cause to revise the current  
 17 briefing schedule on the license-based summary judgment motions in  
 18 the above-captioned cases to allow for cross-motions for summary  
 19 judgment. Accordingly, the Court sets the following schedule:

Event	Date
22 Deadline for Defendants <sup>1</sup> to file their license-based motions for summary judgment.	Thursday, July 19, 2012
23 To the extent possible, Defendants shall file a single joint brief on behalf of more than one, or all, Defendants, with separate sections to address individual differences as needed.	

26  
 27 <sup>1</sup> In this Order, the Court uses the term Defendants to refer  
 28 to the parties opposing Tessera, Inc. in each case.

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1	Deadline for Tessera, Inc. to file its license-based cross-motion for summary judgment, if any, and opposition to Defendants' motions.	Thursday, August 9, 2012
2	Tessera, Inc. shall address these matters in a single brief.	
4	Deadline for Defendants to file their replies in support of their motions for summary judgment and their opposition to Tessera, Inc.'s cross-motion.	Thursday, August 23, 2012
5		
6	The reply and opposition shall be addressed in the same brief. To the extent possible, Defendants shall file a single joint brief on behalf of more than one, or all, Defendants, with separate sections as needed.	
7		
9	Deadline for Tessera, Inc. to file its reply in support of its cross-motion.	Thursday, August 30, 2012
10		
11	Hearing on license-based motions for summary judgment	Thursday, September 20, 2012 at 2:00 p.m.
12		

13                   The Court will entertain a stipulation to change the briefing  
 14 schedule, provided that the parties maintain the same schedule in  
 15 all of the above-captioned cases, that opposing briefs are filed  
 16 in series as described above, not contemporaneously, with as  
 17 little repetition as possible, and that the parties' briefing is  
 18 completed at least three weeks prior to the hearing date.

19                   This Order resolves Docket No. 104 in Case No. 11-6121.

20                   IT IS SO ORDERED.

21  
 22 Dated: 6/15/2012

  
 23 CLAUDIA WILKEN  
 United States District Judge

24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28